

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

HO TRAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARCTIC STORM MANAGEMENT GROUP,
LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C06-1275RSM

ORDER ON MOTION FOR A
PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter is now before the Court for consideration of defendants' motion for a protective order, Dkt. # 22. Defendants ask the Court to quash two Rule 30(b)(6) depositions noted by plaintiff. The Court finds that this motion was filed after the discovery motion cutoff date of July 6, 2007, without leave of Court, and therefore cannot be addressed by the Court. Although the deposition notices were themselves not issued until after the motion cutoff date, defendants had notice on June 27, 2007 of plaintiff's intent to take these depositions. Counsel could have, with prompt action, brought this matter to the Court's attention before the motion cutoff date.

Denial of the motion for a protective order on procedural grounds is not prejudicial to defendants, as the Court finds that defendants have not adequately asserted a need to be protected from "annoyance,

ORDER ON MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE
ORDER - 1

embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense” to justify a protective order. F.R.Civ.Proc. 26(c). Plaintiff, on the other hand, has adequately demonstrated that the depositions are reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence within the meaning of Rule 26.

Defendants’ motion for a protective order is accordingly DENIED.

Dated this 29th day of August, 2007.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE